

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough examination of the claims as evidenced in the Office Action dated June 15, 2004. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the current rejections to the claims in light of the remarks contained herein.

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14, 17-18, and 21-22 are currently presented in this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-12, 14, 17-18, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,112,141 to Briffe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,964,821 to Brunts et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner appears to have repeated many parts of the previous rejection of the claims, and applicants will therefore repeat corresponding arguments previously made in response thereto while addressing the Examiner's recently made comments. In previous correspondence, applicants have discussed the contents of Briffe, and specifically that Briffe discloses the use of a manual switch 38 to return to a previously displayed page (see column 22 lines 38-40, for example). In the most recent Office Action, the Examiner concedes Briffe does not disclose returning to a pre-existing display, without user input, upon a passage of time. The Examiner then relies upon the disclosure of Brunts to teach an automatic time-out feature "which returns to the previous display." The Examiner concludes it would be obvious to use the automatic time-out feature of Brunts instead of the manual input of Briffe to "help the pilot not to be occupied manually inputting interacting with the display." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion. Briffe is not silent as to how to return to a previous display; as previously stated and as conceded by the Examiner, the solution presented by Briffe is a manual operation to change to a pre-existing display. This disclosure of Briffe explicitly *teaches away from* applicants' recital of a return "to a pre-existing display, without user input, upon a passage of time," as recited in applicants' claim 1. In other words, there is no need to use the solution disclosed by Brunts because

Briffe has already come up with a solution: manual operation to return to a pre-existing display. Because Briffe teaches away from this claimed recitation, combination with another reference disclosing such recitation is improper. Claim 1 is therefore allowable.

The Examiner argues that because the disclosures of Briffe and Brunts are analogous art, it would be proper to combine the references to arrive at applicants' invention. However, one of the so-called analogous references (Briffe) teaches away from the automatic time-out feature suggested in Brunts. So regardless of the analogous nature of the two references, it would still be improper to combine the references because of the previously explained incompatibility of the combination of the references. Claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom are therefore allowable.

The Examiner further rejects claim 1 by stating that "it is well settled that it is not 'invention' to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result." However, the returning to a pre-existing display as claimed in applicants' claim 1 is more than merely replacing a manual operation with an automatic operation. Although no user input is required, a passage of time is required prior to returning to a pre-existing display. The inclusion of a passage of time, or delay, makes the claimed returning to a pre-existing display more than a mere replacement of an automatic operation for a manual operation as disclosed in Briffe. Applicants therefore believe this rejection should be withdrawn, and that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable. Furthermore, with respect to claim 7, Briffe does not disclose that a predetermined manual manipulation of the radio control causes a cursor to move to a predetermined position of said display, as recited in claim 7. Specifically, Figures 17-20 of Briffe, which are called out by the Examiner to reject claim 7, do not disclose a cursor, let alone a cursor movement in response to a predetermined manual manipulation of a radio control. The Examiner's further assertions that column 3 lines 7-30 and lines 31-50 of Briffe disclose such cursor control of a radio control are incorrect; the

cited passages discuss cursor selection, but radio control is not disclosed. Claim 7 is therefore allowable.

With respect to claim 8, the Examiner asserts that "Briffe in view of Brunts discloses a unit of display located above each MFD 18, 20 and includes a screen (502), may be a touch-sensitive screen, interacting with the screen displays screen (502) in a pop-up or expanded view of a page or device managed (Briffe, Fig. 17, col. 23, lines 29-67)." Actually, Briffe in column 23 discloses a Multi-function Control Unit (MFCU) 26, 28 that uses touch-sensitive "soft buttons" to call up similarly-sized sub-pages relating to different avionics functions. In contrast to touchable "soft buttons" to call up different pages of the same size, applicants' invention as recited in amended claim 8 *increases the size of an existing view of a predetermined radio function*. Furthermore, while Briffe uses touch-sensitive buttons to call up the pages, applicants' claimed invention requires *manipulation of a cursor* in a predetermined position on the display. The Examiner incorrectly asserts that column 3 lines 7-30 and 31-50 of Briffe discloses an increasing of the size of an existing view of a predetermined radio function; in fact, applicants cannot find anywhere in Briffe a suggestion of increasing the size of an existing view of a predetermined radio function in response to cursor manipulation. Because Briffe does not disclose or suggest the limitations as found in applicants' amended claim 8, claim 8 is therefore allowable.

Independent claim 9 recites that the "graphical user interface returns a display shown on said display to a pre-existing display, without user input, upon a passage of time." As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Briffe teaches away from such a limitation, and the combination of Briffe with any other reference to reject applicants' claim 9 is therefore improper. With respect to the Examiner's further rejection of claim 9, applicants restate that the inclusion of a passage of time, or delay, makes the claimed return to a pre-existing display more than a mere replacement of an automatic operation for a manual operation as disclosed in Briffe. Claim 9 and all claims depending therefrom are therefore allowable.

Claim 9 also includes a limitation similar to amended claim 8, and specifically recites that the "graphical user interface provides an increased size of

an existing view of a predetermined radio function when the cursor is manipulated in a predetermined position on said display." Applicants have previously explained why neither Briffe nor Brunts disclose or teach such limitations, and claim 9 is further allowable for at least the same reasons claim 8 is allowable.

Claim 12 depends from allowable claim 9 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 9 is allowable. Furthermore, claim 12 recites limitations similar to allowable claim 7. As previously explained with respect to claim 7, Briffe does not disclose that a predetermined manual manipulation of the radio control causes a cursor to move to a predetermined position of said display. Specifically, Figures 17-20 of Briffe, which are called out by the Examiner to reject claim 12, do not disclose a cursor, let alone a cursor movement in response to a predetermined manual manipulation of a radio control. Claim 12 is therefore allowable.

Independent claim 14 contains limitations similar to allowable claims 1 and 9 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons those claims are allowable. Specifically, claim 14 recites that the "means for graphically coupling returns a pre-existing view to said means for displaying upon a passage of time without user input." As previously explained with respect to claim 1, Briffe teaches away from such a limitation, and the combination of Briffe with any other reference to reject applicants' claim 14 is improper. With respect to the Examiner's further rejection of claim 14, applicants restate that the inclusion of a passage of time, or delay, makes the claimed return to a pre-existing display more than a mere replacement of an automatic operation for a manual operation as disclosed in Briffe. Claim 14 and all claims depending therefrom are therefore allowable.

Claim 18 depends from allowable claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 14 is allowable. Furthermore, claim 18 has been amended to recite that the "means for graphically coupling increases a size of an existing view of a portion of said means for display so as to show additional radio information, in response to manipulating a cursor in a predetermined area of said means for displaying." This recitation is similar to that of allowable claim 8, and claim 14 is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 8 is allowable.

Claim 21 includes subject matter similar to claims previously demonstrated herein to be allowable. For example, claim 21 recites that the "graphical user interface returns a display shown on said display to a pre-existing display, without user input, upon a passage of time." This recitation is included in similar form in independent claims 1, 9 and 14, and claim 21 is therefore allowable for the reasons cited in the above discussions of these claims.

Claim 21 also recites that the "graphical user interface is coupled to a manually-controlled radio control, so that a predetermined manual manipulation of the radio control causes a cursor to move to a predetermined position of said display, wherein said predetermined position of said display provides information having a predetermined relationship with said predetermined manual manipulation of the radio control." This recitation is similar to allowable claim 7, and as previously discussed above with respect to claim 7, Briffe does not disclose that a predetermined manual manipulation of the radio control causes a cursor to move to a predetermined position of said display. Specifically, Figures 17-20 of Briffe, which are called out by the Examiner to reject claim 21, do not disclose a cursor, let alone a cursor movement in response to a predetermined manual manipulation of a radio control. Claim 21 is therefore allowable.

Claim 22 depends from allowable claim 21 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 21 is allowable. Furthermore, claim 22 has been amended to include recitations similar to allowable claim 8, and specifically recites that the "graphical user interface provides an increased size of an existing view of a predetermined radio function when the cursor is manipulated in a predetermined position on said display." Applicants have previously explained why neither Briffe nor Brunts disclose or teach such limitations, and claim 22 is therefore allowable.

Accordingly, with entry of the amendments and consideration of the arguments and remarks contained herein, all pending claims are now allowable, and a notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. As the pendency of the application now exceeds five years, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to expedite the handling of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if further issues remain in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nathan O. Jensen
Nathan O. Jensen
Reg. No. 41,460
Attorney for Applicant

Rockwell Collins Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
400 Collins Road NE M/S 124-323
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-1184
Facsimile No. (319) 295-8777
Customer No.: 26383